PATTERNS OF POWER · THE CLOSING OF THE FIRST INQUIRY

The Happy Accident

Why Liberty Is Not a Destination but a By-Product With a Recipe — the Evidence of the Studies, the Revision Forced by China, and the Case for Defending What No One Designed

Thomas J. Bryan

with Claude (Anthropic)

2026

Preface

This essay closes the first inquiry of the Patterns of Power project, and it is written to stand alone. The project's case studies — England, America, France, Russia, Byzantium, Norway, Sweden, China, and their companions — were undertaken to test one founding intuition: that the liberties, protections from government, and quality of common life enjoyed by the citizen of a Western liberal democracy are a happy accident — the unintended consequences of elite factional warfare, of ruling groups devising protections for themselves in universal language that later escaped them — and not the destination of any arc of history, neither the classless harmony promised by one teleology nor the enlightened moral ascent promised by the other. The essay reports the result of the testing. The intuition survived, and was revised by its own evidence in three ways: the accident is real — the record contains no case of liberty's institutions built by people intending them for people unlike themselves; the accident has a recipe — it precipitates wherever fragmented elites, universal legitimating words, and positions outside the apex's ownership hold together, and has never once occurred where any of the three was absent; and the accident is reversible — cheaply, legally, and quietly, a finding the present decade is measuring in real time.

The essay is academically grounded and assumes no prior reading: every study it leans on — from Butterfield's anatomy of the Whig interpretation to North and Weingast on credible commitment, from Acemoglu and Robinson's threat models and the Econometrica study of the Great Reform Act to Sen on famine, Stasavage on bureaucracy and assembly, Scheidel on Europe's escape from empire, and the 2026 assessments of V-Dem and Freedom House — is introduced and described, not merely cited. Its central revision is the one forced by the project's adversarial test case: in China, the most universal legitimating vocabulary of the ancient world, memorised by every educated man for two thousand years, never bound a throne — because words are tools, and tools must be held from somewhere, and the imperial filter had bought up every somewhere. Plurality is the rifling; without it, the same words that widen liberty can only crown new masters.

The conclusion is the case for defending liberal democracy without loving it: not as a destination history protects, but as a by-product under maintenance — defended from its ledger of verifiable gains, by audit rather than anthem, at the address where arrangements are actually unbuilt: the filters, the appointments, the housekeeping. The work is gardening, not architecture, and it has no last day.

A Note on This Collaboration

This essay, like the series it closes, is a collaboration between a human author and an artificial intelligence. The founding intuition — the happy accident, the reluctant advocacy, the refusal of both teleologies — and the framework through which the project's twelve studies were conducted are Thomas J. Bryan's. The synthesis of the casework, the survey and description of the scholarly literature, the drafting of the text, and the formal statement of the revisions — including the demotion of the loaded-words proposition forced by the Chinese case — are the work of Claude, an AI model built by Anthropic, directed by the author's framework and revised under his disciplines. The essay's seventh part states the evidence that would falsify its own thesis, because the project's coda requires its claims to be held as tested, never revealed. Whatever errors remain are the collaboration's own.

The Argument in Eight Parts

Part I · The Claim

What the founding phrase was coined to deny and what the inquiry has since established: the accident is real, has a recipe, and is reversible — with the project's instruments (position logic, the laminate of force and belief, loaded words, tested against revealed, filters, plurality against foreclosure) introduced from scratch for the reader who needs them.

Part II · The Two Arcs

The teleologies the essay denies, described fairly: the Whig interpretation from Macaulay through Butterfield's 1931 anatomy to Fukuyama's end of history and the modernisation hypothesis Przeworski and Limongi unwound; and the Marxist engine and terminus — what the project keeps of the extraction analysis, why class consciousness fails twenty centuries of Chinese rebellion, the Asiatic-mode patch that concedes the point, and the withering state that became the permanent apparatus. Both arcs as revealed doctrines, with Popper's piecemeal alternative acknowledged as this project's ancestor.

Part III · The Recipe

The three conditions and their measured literatures: fragmentation and exit — Tilly, Scheidel, Hirschman, Mokyr, and Stasavage's bureaucracy finding; the forced universality of legitimating language and the loading of the words; and the positions — Montesquieu's intermediate bodies, North and Weingast's credible commitment, the natural-state framework, Acemoglu and Robinson's threat models, the Econometrica study of 1832, the franchise-and-threat literature, and the structural-demographic pressure clock from Ibn Khaldun to Goldstone and Turchin — assembled into the one machine that precipitates the by-product.

Part IV · The Evidence of the Cases

The inquiry's studies read as a single experiment: England as type specimen from Runnymede to the creditor coup of 1688; America's little nations — intended mechanism, unintended clientele — with Douglass, Seneca Falls, Lincoln, and Calhoun's failed disavowal; France and Russia as the radical-failure chain; Byzantium as the null case that deposited no words; Norway and Sweden as the controlled pair that isolated the ground; and China as the adversarial control — words at maximum, positions at zero, crowns only — with Taiwan settling that culture was the constant and positions the variable.

Part V · The Revision

What the evidence did to the thesis: the words demoted — tools that must be held from somewhere, plurality as the rifling, proven by the rulers' own failed recalls from Falsen and Calhoun to the expurgated Mencius and Document No. 9; the accident upgraded to a by-product with a recipe, reproducible and therefore defensible; and the inheritors' half restored — unintended by the authors, unworked-for by no one, every notch priced by organisation the excluded built at cost.

Part VI · The Ledger and the Asymmetry

The case for defence without love: Sen on famine and the free press, the Journal of Political Economy on democracy and growth, the democratic peace with its hedges, and error-correction as the structural gain; against it the audit of reversal — Weimar's three months, Levitsky and Ziblatt's elected road, the term clock deleted by 2,958 votes to 2, and the 2026 measurements of V-Dem and Freedom House, decline and resilience

entered together; and the conclusion that the reluctant advocate — audit, not anthem — is the load-bearing kind.

Part VII · What Is Not Claimed

The edges: the recipe as maintenance conditions, not guarantee, with Weimar as the limit case — the floor staffed by the unformed, the pressure past working range, the claimants who wanted the building down; the other ledger — what foreclosure's paxes genuinely delivered and the unmerged tension the second inquiry inherits; and the four findings that would falsify this essay, named so the reader can hunt them.

Part VIII · The Posture

The argument reassembled on one page, and the address of the work: debug, don't defend; tested, not revealed; tend the counterweights without end; pry with the rulers' own words from positions worth building; watch the housekeeping, because reversal arrives as administration. Gardening, not architecture — no arc, a recipe, and work without a last day.

PART I

THE CLAIM

What the Phrase Was Coined to Deny, What the Inquiry Has Since Established, and the Instruments a New Reader Needs Before the Argument Begins

A Note on What This Essay Is

This essay closes the first inquiry of the Patterns of Power project, and it is written to stand alone: a reader who has never opened the project's case studies should be able to follow every step, and every scholar and study cited along the way is introduced as if for the first time. The project began, years before any of its volumes existed, with a phrase its author used to describe his own position — a reluctant advocate of liberal democracy — and with an intuition that phrase carried: that the protections from government, the liberties, and the quality of common life that a citizen of the United States or of Western Europe enjoys were a happy accident — the unintended consequences of elite factional warfare, of ruling groups devising protections for themselves in language that later escaped them — and not, as the reigning stories on both left and right would have it, the destination of any arc. The project's twelve case studies were undertaken to test that intuition against the historical record, on grounds as different as thirteenth-century England, tenth-century Byzantium, and twenty-first-century China, with the explicit discipline that the intuition itself be held as a hypothesis — revisable by evidence, like everything else.

This essay reports the result. The intuition survived the testing, and was changed by it, in three ways the essay will argue at length. First, the accident is real: the historical record, read closely, contains no case — not one — in which the institutions of liberty were built by people intending to build the institutions of liberty for people unlike themselves; every durable widening began as a faction's self-protection, a calculated concession, or a pressure release priced cheaper than rupture. Second, the accident has a recipe: it recurs, on independent grounds and different timetables, wherever three conditions hold together, and it has never once occurred where any one of them was absent — which means happy accident undersells the finding, and the essay will propose a more exact phrase. Third, the accident is reversible, and reversal is cheaper, faster, and more orderly than construction was — which converts the whole analysis from an antiquarian exercise into a maintenance manual, and supplies the only argument for defending liberal democracy that does not depend on loving it.

What the essay denies, it denies symmetrically, and the reader is asked to hold the symmetry from the start, because it is the project's signature. There is no law of history by which societies arrive at a classless harmony where the common man stands free of hierarchy; the inquiry's volumes on revolutionary Russia and revolutionary China bury that arc under the largest body counts in the human record. And there is no law of history by which exposure to liberal ideas enlightens leaders and bends societies toward justice; the inquiry's China volume shows the most universal legitimating vocabulary of the ancient world memorised by every educated man for two thousand years, and two later floods of imported liberal thought, building nothing that could hold. But the denial of both arcs is not fatalism, and the essay's third part exists to block that exit too: the conditions under which liberty precipitates are identifiable, evidenced, and — this is the point of knowing them

— maintainable. Nothing guarantees the outcome. Nothing forbids it. People in positions decide, with the materials at hand, and the materials include knowledge of how the machine works.

I. The Instruments, Briefly

The project's method must be stated before the argument can run, and a paragraph suffices for each instrument; the framework volume develops them fully, and the case studies apply them.

The foundation is position logic: the working assumption that history contains no forces — no destiny, no spirit of the age, no arc — only people in positions, each facing a menu of possible actions priced by his circumstances, deciding with the materials at hand. The patterns historians observe are what such decisions sum to when many people occupy similar positions. Two caveats discipline the tool: what counts as a benefit to a person is set by his formation — the values installed in him before he could weigh them — so the analyst must price the menu by the actor's lights, not his own; and a cost deters only where it is credibly enforced, so the analyst must always ask not what the law said but what the position-holder believed would actually happen. The logic operates at three layers: the individual calculating; the cohort converging, without coordination or consciousness, on whatever visibly works; and the institution selecting its members — through what the project calls filters — until the institution's behaviour is produced by its staffing and intended by no one.

On this foundation sit four findings from the inquiry's casework. A durable hierarchy is a laminate: a floor of force with a managed belief laid over it, because force alone is ruinously expensive — every subject obeys exactly to the boundary of enforcement — while belief, installed by the formation machinery of family, school, and pulpit, makes obedience self-administering and therefore cheap. A ruling order's legitimating language must bind to legitimate, and in every post-axial culture the binding idiom is universal — all men, the people, Heaven's care for the governed — so the rulers' own words always say more than the rulers mean, and become loaded words: deposits the excluded can later seize and fire back. Doctrines divide into tested and revealed: a tested doctrine is revised when evidence defeats it; a revealed one reads every failure as insufficiently faithful execution, never as refutation — and revealed doctrines, because they cannot stop, are the ones that count corpses. And the master variable, on which this essay will turn, is plurality against foreclosure: whether there exist counterweights — courts, presses, estates, churches, parties, properties — that the apex does not own. Where they exist, pressure releases as reform and the loaded words widen liberty; where the apex has bought or broken them all, pressure stores until rupture, and the rupture reloads the same shape.

The reader now holds the instruments. The essay's remaining work is to show what they cut.

PART II

THE TWO ARCS

The Stories the Accident Was Coined Against — What Each Claims, Why Each Was Reasonable, How Each Fails the Record, and What Makes Both Revealed

A Note on Fairness

This part describes the two great teleologies — the liberal arc and the Marxist terminus — at sufficient length that a reader meeting them here for the first time understands what serious people believed and why. The project's discipline requires fairness to the epistemic position of every doctrine's holders: both arcs were reasonable inferences from the evidence available to their first formulators, and the essay says so before it shows where the fuller record breaks them. What the part ultimately argues is not that either story is foolish but that both share a structure — the structure the project calls revealed — and that the structure, not the content, is what makes them dangerous to the very outcomes their adherents want.

I. The Liberal Arc

The first story holds that history bends. In its classical form it is the Whig interpretation of history — the name comes from the British parliamentary party of liberty and progress, and the canonical statement of the style is Thomas Babington Macaulay's History of England, written in the 1840s and 1850s, which narrated the English past as a long ascent toward the constitutional liberty of Macaulay's own day, with every earlier actor graded by whether he helped or hindered the arrival. The name became a diagnosis in 1931, when a young Cambridge historian named Herbert Butterfield published a short book, The Whig Interpretation of History, which identified the style's defining error: reading the past as the present's preparation — sorting historical actors into friends and enemies of an outcome none of them was pursuing, and thereby systematically misdescribing what they were actually doing and why. Butterfield's point was methodological, but it carried a substantive sting the present essay inherits: if the seventeenth-century parliamentarians were not trying to build liberal democracy, then liberal democracy is not what trying looks like when it succeeds; it is what something else looks like when it precipitates.

The arc's modern revival arrived in 1989, when the American political scientist Francis Fukuyama published an essay — expanded in 1992 into the book The End of History and the Last Man — arguing that the collapse of communism revealed liberal democracy as, in his phrase, "the end point of mankind's ideological evolution": not that events would stop, but that the ideological contest was settled, no coherent systemic rival remaining. The essay was subtler than its slogan, and Fukuyama himself has spent three decades adding qualifications; but the slogan did the historical work, because it told a generation of policymakers and publics that the destination had been reached and the remaining task was arrival management — that, for instance, a China admitted to the world's trading system would liberalise on schedule, because that is the direction history moves. A softer academic cousin said something similar with data: the modernisation hypothesis, classically stated by the sociologist Seymour Martin Lipset in 1959, observed that wealth and democracy correlate strongly and inferred

that development produces democratisation. The inference, it turned out, ran past the evidence: a careful re-examination by the political scientists Adam Przeworski and Fernando Limongi in 1997, using the full post-war record, found that economic development does not reliably cause transitions to democracy — dictatorships grow rich and stay dictatorships — but does powerfully sustain democracies that exist, which already have arisen for other reasons. The correlation was real; the arrow was not. Wealth is mortar, not seed.

The project's casework breaks the arc on harder ground still, and the China volume was commissioned as the decisive test. There, the legitimating vocabulary of the empire — Heaven's revocable Mandate, the canonical teaching that the people outweigh the ruler and that killing a tyrant is no regicide — was not merely available but memorised, as the condition of office, by every member of the governing class for two thousand years; and from the 1890s the entire Western liberal library arrived in translation and flood, absorbed by exactly the class an arc theory would cast as its carriers. Neither the indigenous words nor the imported ones built one durable institution of liberty, and the republic of 1912, written onto ground that held no independent positions — no court that could rule against power, no chartered city, no church, no propertied estate — fell to the armed within a year and to warlords within a decade. Ideas, the inquiry concluded, are materials, not motors. The arc theory cannot explain why the same ideas built constitutions on one ground and nothing on another; the framework can, and the explanation — positions, not enlightenment — is this essay's third part.

II. The Marxist Terminus

The second story also holds that history moves, by a different engine to a different end. Karl Marx, writing across the middle of the nineteenth century, proposed that the engine is the struggle between classes defined by their relation to production; that each mode of production — ancient slavery, feudalism, capitalism — generates the class that will bury it; that the modern state is, in the famous formula of the Communist Manifesto, essentially a committee managing the common affairs of the property-owning class; and that the industrial working class, brought to consciousness of itself as a class by the very concentration capitalism imposes on it, would in time seize the state, abolish class itself, and thereby abolish the state's reason for being — after which, in the phrase Friedrich Engels supplied in 1878, the state "withers away," leaving the free association of producers: the terminus, the common man finally clear of hierarchy. The intermediate concept doing the heaviest work is class consciousness — the transformation of a class in itself (people sharing an objective position) into a class for itself (people knowing it, organising on it, and acting as one historical agent); the Hungarian philosopher György Lukács built the doctrine's most sophisticated version around exactly this transformation in 1923.

The project's posture toward this apparatus is selective, and the selection should be stated plainly because the project's author has always stated it. The analytical half of Marx the inquiry largely keeps: that ruling arrangements run on extraction; that the state is, very often and very demonstrably, an instrument of those positioned to staff it; that law and official morality tend to track the interests of the dominant — these are findings the project's own casework confirms on every continent, and position logic can be fairly described as class analysis with the metaphysics removed and the resolution increased: not two great classes marching, but thousands of positions pricing. What the inquiry rejects is the engine and the destination. Class consciousness, as a historical motor, fails the record at its own chosen sites: the project's China volume surveys twenty centuries of peasant rebellion — rebellion by the structurally exploited, against the structurally extracting, over and over, at the largest scales on earth — and finds not one instance of a class acting as a class for its emancipation as a class; it finds starving men pricing rebellion against the regime's own penalties, millenarian churches organising the desperate, and failed elite aspirants supplying the officers, and it finds every victorious

rebellion crowning a new emperor, because a force built to defeat a hierarchy must itself become one. Marx met the Chinese record himself and, unable to fit it to the stages, fenced it off as a special case — the Asiatic mode of production, a category for societies allegedly outside the feudal sequence; the German-American sinologist Karl Wittfogel built the fence into a wall in his 1957 book Oriental Despotism, attributing Eastern autocracy to the management requirements of irrigation. The patch concedes the point: a universal engine that needs a continental exemption is not universal.

And the terminus fails by the heaviest evidence in the inquiry. Where the doctrine took power — the project's Russian and Chinese volumes are its records — the state did not wither; it duplicated, the party apparatus growing above the state apparatus, the promised emergency becoming the permanent condition, exactly as the project's commitment trap predicts: an arrangement legitimated by a destination must treat the destination's non-arrival as the work of enemies, and the hunt for enemies is a permanent institution. The Soviet and Maoist states were not betrayals of the doctrine by bad men, on the inquiry's reading; they were what the doctrine's structure builds when the instrument trap hands it a hierarchy and the commitment trap forbids it to stop.

III. The Shared Structure

The essay's point in this part is not the scoreboard; it is the diagnosis, because the diagnosis is what transfers. Both arcs are revealed doctrines in the project's technical sense: each carries a terminus — the classless association, the liberal end of history — whose non-arrival cannot count as evidence against the theory. For the Marxist, every failed revolution was betrayed, premature, or sabotaged — never disconfirming; for the end-of-history liberal, every authoritarian consolidation is a bump, a lag, a transition — never disconfirming. The philosopher of science Karl Popper, whose 1945 work The Open Society and Its Enemies the project acknowledges as an ancestor, made the structural point a generation early: theories that no possible evidence can defeat are not strong theories but unfalsifiable ones, and politics conducted on them — what Popper called utopian engineering, the wholesale remaking of society toward a blueprint — systematically outruns its errors, because the blueprint, being revealed, converts every error into a reason for more force. Popper's alternative, piecemeal engineering — reform in testable increments, each revisable — is the tested posture this project found, independently, in every arrangement that widened liberty without counting corpses. The two arcs, then, are not opposites; they are the same epistemic machine pointed at different paradises. And the practical danger of the liberal version, the essay will argue in its sixth part, is quieter but live: a defender who believes the arc believes the destination defends itself — and stops tending the conditions, at exactly the moment the machinery begins, as it always can, to run backward.

PART III

THE RECIPE

The Three Conditions Under Which the Accident Precipitates, the Scholarship That Has Measured Each, and the Mechanism That Joins Them

A Note on Standing

This part states the essay's central empirical claim and grounds it. The claim: across the inquiry's casework and the wider comparative record, durable widenings of liberty — enforceable protections from power, extended over time to people the protections' authors never intended — occur where, and only where, three conditions hold together: the ruling elite is fragmented, so that no faction owns the machinery that selects rulers; the order's legitimating language is universal, so that protections written by a faction for itself are deposited in words that cannot be fenced; and there exist positions outside the apex's ownership from which those words can later be fired incrementally. Where all three hold, the accident happens — repeatedly, on unrelated grounds, on timetables set by local conditions. Where any one is absent, it has never happened. The conditions were not discovered by this project; each has a measured scholarly literature, and the part's purpose is to introduce that literature properly, because the reader deserves to know that the recipe rests on more than the project's own files.

I. First Condition: No One Owns the Filter

The deepest condition is elite fragmentation — not the absence of elites, which no society has achieved, but the absence of any single faction that owns the filter: the project's term for the machinery through which the governing class selects, promotes, and reproduces itself. The condition's importance emerges most clearly from the comparative question of why Europe, of all places, generated constitutional liberty, and the modern scholarship on that question converges from several directions on the same answer: because Europe, almost uniquely, failed to unify.

The sociologist Charles Tilly, in his 1990 study Coercion, Capital, and European States, compressed a career's research into a famous reciprocal: war made the state, and the state made war. European rulers, locked from the fall of Rome in a permanent multi-state competition, needed revenue and men on a scale their domains would not volunteer, and were forced — the crucial word — to bargain: with cities for loans, with estates for taxes, with subjects for service, conceding charters, parliaments, and rights as the price of fiscal survival. The Stanford historian Walter Scheidel, in Escape from Rome (2019), pushed the argument to its hinge: Europe's decisive inheritance was not Rome but Rome's failure to return — no later power ever reunified the continent, and the resulting polycentrism meant that no European apex could ever foreclose the whole board; a dissenting noble, a heterodox printer, a taxed merchant, or a persecuted sect could always exit to a rival jurisdiction, and rulers competing for mobile capital and talent were disciplined by the exit option itself. (The economist Albert Hirschman's 1970 classic Exit, Voice, and Loyalty supplies the general theory: where exit is possible, voice gains leverage; the project's Norwegian and Swedish volumes found the mechanism operating at the level of

common people, when the emigrant door to America drained, every year, exactly the pressure that broke foreclosed societies elsewhere.) The economic historian Joel Mokyr added the intellectual layer: early modern Europe combined fragmented political authority with a unified market for ideas — the Republic of Letters — so that a thinker could be censored in one jurisdiction and published in the next, and no orthodoxy could be enforced continent-wide. And the political scientist David Stasavage, in The Decline and Rise of Democracy (2020), supplied the inverse case with a finding this project's China volume confirmed in detail: societies whose rulers developed strong bureaucracies early — China above all, where the registers and the examination system gave the apex direct knowledge of, and access to, the population — never needed to bargain with assemblies at all, and the consultative institutions common in weakly administered societies were crowded out before they could harden. The first condition, in short, has a measured history: liberty's ground was prepared wherever power was condemned to compete, and sterilised wherever one apparatus could see and staff everything.

II. Second Condition: The Words Must Be Universal

The second condition concerns language, and it begins from a constraint on rulers rather than a virtue in them. An order's legitimating story must bind its subjects to count as legitimation — must give the governed reasons that feel like reasons — and in every literate civilisation after the great axial religions and philosophies, the only idioms with binding force are universal ones: God's law, natural right, the people, Heaven's care for the governed. A faction writing protections for itself therefore faces a drafting problem it cannot solve: protections phrased nakedly — liberties for us, the well-born of this province — do not legitimate, because naked self-dealing is precisely what legitimating language exists to launder; so the faction writes no free man shall be imprisoned but by the law of the land, or all men are created equal, intending the words' practical scope to be its own membership, and deposits, in the public record, a sentence whose grammar contains no fence. The project calls the deposits loaded words, and its casework finds the loading mechanism operating identically across unconnected civilisations: the barons at Runnymede in 1215 wrote "free man" meaning men like themselves, and seven centuries of English claimants climbed through the phrase; the planters and merchants of 1776 wrote "all men" meaning, in practice, propertied white men, and were told so, forever after, by everyone the grammar included; the Norwegian notables of 1814 enfranchised the freeholding farmer to outvote rivals, and built the widest electorate in Europe by accident; the Zhou conquerors of ancient China justified their seizure with a Heaven that judges rulers by the people's welfare, and armed every rebel for three thousand years. The condition's force is best seen in the rulers who understood it and tried to escape: the essay's fifth part assembles the recall attempts — an American senator denouncing his own founding document's central sentence, a Chinese emperor physically cutting the right of rebellion from the examination canon — and their uniform failure. Words, once deposited in universal form and venerated, are not the depositors' to edit.

III. Third Condition: Somewhere to Stand

The third condition is the one the project's hardest test forced it to elevate, and the next part tells that story; here the essay introduces the scholarship that measured it long before. The insight is old — Montesquieu, the eighteenth-century French theorist whose Spirit of the Laws shaped every later constitutionalist, argued that liberty survives only where intermediate bodies (estates, parlements, corporations) stand between subject and sovereign — but its modern, quantified form begins with a 1989 article by the economic historians Douglass North and Barry Weingast, "Constitutions and Commitment." Examining England's Glorious Revolution of 1688, they showed that the settlement's machinery — parliamentary control of taxation, an independent

judiciary, a crown that could no longer repudiate its debts — solved a problem economists call credible commitment: a sovereign strong enough to enforce contracts is strong enough to break them, and only institutional counterweights make his promises believable; the measurable proof was the crown's borrowing, which exploded after 1688 at falling interest rates, because lenders now lent to an arrangement rather than a man. North, with John Wallis and Weingast, generalised the finding in Violence and Social Orders (2009): most societies in history are what they call natural states, in which elites limit violence by sharing rents among themselves and access to organisations — firms, parties, churches — is a privilege the coalition grants; a few societies have crossed into open-access orders, where any citizen may form an organisation, and the crossing happens not by enlightenment but when intra-elite arrangements — impersonal law among elites first, perpetual organisations, consolidated control of force — make opening access cheaper for the elites themselves than holding it closed. The reader should hear how exactly that matches the accident: the open order arrives as elite self-dealing generalised, its universal form an unintended by-product of the elite's own requirements.

The widening mechanism — how the excluded actually get in — has its own measured literature, and it prices concessions, not conversions. The economists Daron Acemoglu and James Robinson, in their 2006 Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy, formalised democratisation as an elite calculation under threat: a mobilised excluded class can credibly threaten revolution only episodically, so promises of future redistribution are not believable, and the franchise itself is what a frightened elite concedes — an institutional pawn ticket, handing over the machinery rather than the promise, exactly when refusal's price spikes. (Their 2019 book The Narrow Corridor restates the project's master variable at book length: liberty lives only in the moving corridor where state capacity and social counter-power grow together, each able to check the other.) The prediction has been tested against named events. The economists Toke Aidt and Raphaël Franck, in a 2015 study in the journal Econometrica, examined Britain's Great Reform Act of 1832 constituency by constituency and found that parliamentary support for franchise reform tracked local exposure to the Swing riots — the rural insurrection of 1830-31 — with reform votes concentrated precisely where the threat had burned nearest; Aidt with Peter Jensen showed the same pattern across eleven European countries and a century of suffrage extensions, each clustering in the shadow of revolutionary events abroad; and the political scientists Magnus Rasmussen and Carl Henrik Knutsen demonstrated it for labour rights, with the eight-hour day sweeping Europe in the precise season — 1919 — when revolutionary credibility peaked. The project's own volumes supply the documentary interiors of the same mechanism: the Swedish first chamber rejecting universal suffrage in the spring of 1918 and capitulating to an almost identical bill in December, with Germany's monarchy collapsing next door and the conservatives' own diaries recording the arithmetic. And the pressure side of the mechanism has its scholarship too: the historian Jack Goldstone's Revolution and Rebellion in the Early Modern World (1991) and the scientist Peter Turchin's structural-demographic work — descending, both acknowledge, from the fourteenth-century historian Ibn Khaldun — measure how population growth, elite overproduction (too many credentialed aspirants for too few positions), and fiscal strain load societies toward rupture on roughly secular cycles; the project's China volume found the cleanest specimen in the record, an examination system that mass-produced formed and refused men for thirteen centuries and supplied, in a four-times-failed candidate named Hong Xiuquan, the prophet of history's deadliest civil war.

IV. The Joint

The three conditions are not a checklist but a machine, and the essay closes the part by assembling it. Fragmented elites write protections against each other (first condition) in the only language that legitimates (second), depositing loaded words; pressure from below accumulates by the structural-demographic clock; and

where independent positions exist (third), the pressure and the words meet — the excluded, organised in chapels, presses, unions, and parties the apex does not own, fire the order's own sentences at it, and the positioned elite, pricing concession against rupture by the threat literature's arithmetic, widens the order one notch, in its own interest, intending nothing further. Repeat for centuries. No actor in the sequence is building liberal democracy; liberal democracy is what the sequence precipitates. That is the accident — and the next part shows it happening, and failing to happen, across the inquiry's twelve grounds.

PART IV

THE EVIDENCE OF THE CASES

The Inquiry's Studies Read as a Single Experiment — the Replications, the Null Cases, and the Control That Settled the Decisive Variable

A Note on Design

The project's case studies were written as histories, but they can be read — and this part reads them — as an experimental series: the same instruments applied to grounds chosen for variation, with the recipe's three conditions present, partial, or absent, and the outcomes compared. A reader who wants any case in full is referred to its volume; here each appears as an exhibit, described from scratch, with its finding stated.

I. England: The Type Specimen

The English case is the accident's type specimen, and the project's England series traced it from the conquest of 1066. The crown that William built was strong by design and contested by inheritance, and in 1215 a faction of barons — taxed past endurance by King John's lost wars — cornered him at Runnymede and extracted Magna Carta: a peace treaty among magnates, securing baronial inheritance, baronial courts, baronial consent to baronial taxation. Its famous clauses were drafted in the universal register the age required — no free man seized but by lawful judgment — and the document failed within months, was reissued for decades as successive kings purchased peace, and spent four centuries being cited upward by classes its authors would not have dined with: the seventeenth-century parliamentary lawyers, Edward Coke at their head, fired its sentences against the Stuarts as if the barons had been constitutionalists, and the misreading built constitutionalism. The 1688 settlement — the creditor coup North and Weingast measured — completed the type: an elite faction, protecting property and Protestant succession, accidentally invented the credible state. At no point in the sequence did anyone intend the destination; at every point, fragmented elites, universal words, and independent positions — common-law courts, the Inns, the City, the counties — were all present. The accident precipitated continuously for seven centuries.

II. America: The Multiple Little Nations

The American case sharpened the project's understanding of intention, and the essay states the finding carefully because the case is the one its author began from. The founders were not one elite but several — the project's volume calls them little nations: tidewater planters, New England merchants and clergy, mid-Atlantic traders, backcountry settlers — whose positions converged twice: in 1776, against an imperial centre repricing their autonomy and debts, and in 1787, after Shays' Rebellion — the armed rising of indebted Massachusetts farmers in 1786-87, closing courts to stop foreclosures — frightened the propertied of every region into wanting a federal government strong enough to enforce contracts, suppress risings, and fund itself. The historian Charles Beard scandalised the academy in 1913 by arguing, in An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution, that the Philadelphia delegates were creditors and security-holders designing for their portfolios; later scholarship

dismantled his ledger-by-ledger claims while leaving standing the structural point this project needs: the convention was factions of property solving factions of property's problems. And here the case adds its precision. The protections were intended — the delegates, fearing that any one faction might capture the new centre and turn it on the rest, deliberately built the stalemate: the separated powers, the staggered elections, the courts, the amendment locks; James Madison, in the fifty-first Federalist paper, stated the design principle in seven words — "Ambition must be made to counteract ambition" — and in the tenth, argued that the republic's very extent would keep any faction from majority. What was unintended was the clientele. The machinery was built by its designers for its designers, in the binding language of the age — we the people, all men created equal — with the exclusions priced in silence and euphemism: the three-fifths clause, the fugitive-servant clause, the twenty-year slave-trade protection. Intended mechanism, unintended beneficiaries: that is the accident's exact shape, and American history is the longest documented record of the beneficiaries arriving — the abolitionists building, from pulpits and presses the apex did not own, the positions from which the Declaration could be fired; Frederick Douglass, the escaped slave become the century's great orator, standing before a white abolitionist audience on the fifth of July, 1852, to ask what the Fourth of July could mean to the slave, and answering by claiming the founders' words as a promissory instrument their heirs had dishonoured; the women at Seneca Falls in 1848 drafting their Declaration of Sentiments as a verbatim recasting of 1776 — all men and women are created equal — because the loaded words were the only ammunition that could not be ruled out of court; Lincoln, in 1857, defending the Declaration's sentence as "a standard maxim for free society," set deliberately high to be constantly approximated. Each widening, the volume found, was also a position pricing: emancipation arrived as war measure, the franchise extensions as party arithmetic, the great civil-rights statutes as Cold War accounting and electoral calculation — calculation and inheritance braided, conversion almost nowhere. The conditions all held; the accident ran for two centuries; and the same record carries the warning the essay banks for its sixth part, because the American apex also produced the clearest recall attempt in the Western file: John C. Calhoun, the South's leading constitutional theorist, rose in the Senate in 1848 to denounce the proposition that all men are created equal — his own founding charter's sentence — as "the most false and dangerous of all political errors": a ruling faction, recognising precisely what the deposited words were doing, attempting to disavow the deposit. The disavowal lost; the words could not be recalled; the war that followed was, among other things, the price of the attempt.

III. France and Russia: The Chain

The French and Russian volumes supplied the inquiry's anatomy of the radical-failure chain — what happens when the pressure releases not through positions but through rupture. In both cases the old order had foreclosed its counterweights (the French crown had broken its estates and parlements into ornament; the tsars had never permitted any), the words arrived (the rights of man; the people), and the rupture, when it came, met the project's three traps in sequence: the metabolic trap, in which tearing out the coordinating apparatus — grain trade, currency, administration — collects the difference in famine and terror; the craft-of-rule deficit, in which men who could seize a state proved unable to run a complex society and substituted coercion for competence; and the instrument trap, in which the force built to destroy the hierarchy became the hierarchy, the party re-pouring the master harder. The Russian volume, The Foreclosed Republic, carried the finding the essay needs here: where no positions exist, the loaded words do not widen the order; they crown its replacement — and the replacement, built by an instrument, inherits the foreclosure. The rupture reloads the shape.

IV. Byzantium: The Null Case

The Byzantine volume served the inquiry as its null case, and its value is exactly its emptiness. The Eastern Roman arrangement endured a thousand years — by many measures the most successful single state in European history — on a laminate of overwhelming administrative force and a belief that, uniquely in the project's casework, deposited no loaded words at all: the official theology made the emperor God's vice-gerent and the hierarchy heaven's mirror, language that confirmed subjection rather than promising anything the excluded could later claim. The empire had riots, coups, and usurpations beyond counting — the apex changed violently, constantly — and produced, in a millennium, no Magna Carta, no estates, no charter, nothing: not because Byzantines were servile, but because the legitimating vocabulary contained no sentence worth firing and the apex owned every position from which a sentence could have been fired. The null case proved the recipe by subtraction: where neither words nor positions exist, even a thousand years of pressure produces only rotation at the top.

V. Norway and Sweden: The Controlled Pair

The two Scandinavian volumes gave the inquiry its nearest approach to a controlled comparison: one creed, one church-built literacy machine, one shared king after 1814, and divergent ground. Norway had almost no aristocracy — four centuries of Danish rule had left a salaried official class and a free, literate peasantry — and when its elite wrote the 1814 constitution in the universal register of the age, the freeholder franchise was already among the widest in Europe; the words ran fast on the open ground, and the timetable was short: full parliamentary government by 1884, manhood suffrage by 1898, women — first in any sovereign state — by 1913. Sweden had what Norway lacked, a real aristocracy and a wealth-weighted franchise — in its municipal scale a rich man could cast forty votes, and companies voted — and the identical mechanism accordingly ran a full generation slower, the decisive concession arriving only in December 1918 with revolution visible across the Baltic. Same creed, same words, same organisational inheritance; different distribution of positions; different timetable, same destination. The pair isolated the variable: the ground, not the culture, sets the clock. And both volumes documented the valve: the emigrant door to America — a fifth of Norway, a sixth of Sweden — venting, decade by decade, the exact class whose counterparts elsewhere manned the barricades; Hirschman's exit, operating at the scale of nations, buying the bargaining time in which voice could work.

VI. China: The Control That Settled It

The China volume was commissioned as the series' adversarial test — the subject chosen by the project's research half as the case most likely to break the framework — and it returned the finding that forced this essay's central revision. There the second condition held at maximum strength: the Mandate of Heaven was universal, people-centred, and revolution-licensing, and the examination system made its memorisation the qualification for office for thirteen hundred years. The third condition held at zero: the same examination system, by absorbing every ambitious family's wealth and sons into the state's own ladder, dissolved — generation after generation — the merchant estates, autonomous cities, independent law, and separate church from which the words might have been fired incrementally; the philosopher's licence to kill tyrants was in every schoolroom, and there was nowhere to stand to demand anything less than the throne. The result, across two thousand years: the words fired constantly — every dynasty fell to claimants marching on the Mandate's logic — and bound nothing, ever; they could delegitimate a master absolutely and legitimate his replacement

absolutely, and could do nothing in between, because in between is where the positions would have stood. And the volume carried its own internal control, which settled the residual hypothesis that culture, not structure, was the cause: on Taiwan after 1949, the same canon, script, and families — under a land reform that bred smallholders, foreign dependence that imported pressure, local elections that became real positions, and a middle class the party-state did not own — converted within a generation into a constitutional democracy under exactly the vocabulary the mainland's directives instruct cadres to combat. Culture constant; positions variable; outcome flipped. The decisive variable in the whole recipe is the third condition, and the next part states what that finding did to the framework itself.

PART V

THE REVISION

What the Evidence Did to the Phrase — the Demotion of the Words, the Upgrade of the Accident, and the Half the Phrase Was Hiding

A Note on Posture

A framework that cannot be revised by its own casework is, by its own definition, revealed, and this part exists because the project's discipline requires the opposite. Three revisions came out of the inquiry's testing, and the essay states each as a correction, with the evidence that forced it.

I. First Revision: The Words Are Demoted

The loaded-words proposition, as the project first carried it, said too much. In its early form — built on English and American material — it implied that universal legitimating language is itself a widening engine: deposit the words, wait, and the excluded will climb through the grammar. The Chinese case broke that form cleanly, as the last part showed: vocabulary as universal as any in the human record, more thoroughly installed than any in the human record, and two thousand years of firing that never moved a throne one cubit toward constraint. The revision the evidence dictates is this: words are tools, and tools must be held from somewhere. Where positions outside the apex's ownership exist, deposited universal words become pry-bars — instruments of incremental widening, fired from the pulpit, the press, the court, the union hall, each firing winning a notch that the position then holds. Where the apex owns every position, the same words become crowns: they retain absolute power to delegitimate a failing master and to legitimate his replacement — which is why the Mandate's vocabulary never died — and no power whatever to do anything in between, because the intermediate uses all require a platform that survives the firing. Plurality, in the essay's image, is the rifling: the words are live ammunition everywhere, but without the barrel they arrive as explosion or not at all.

The demotion is confirmed, with a neatness the project did not expect, by the behaviour of rulers — because across unconnected civilisations, the men at the apex repeatedly read the words exactly as this framework reads them, and tried to take them back, and the attempts form a single catalogue with a single result. In Norway, Christian Magnus Falsen — principal author of the 1814 constitution and of its wide farmer franchise — watched the franchise begin returning men he distrusted and spent his later career trying to narrow what he had written; he failed, and died politically isolated, the words already venerated past recall. In the United States, Calhoun's 1848 disavowal of the Declaration's central sentence — described in the last part — failed before the decade was out. In Ming China, the founding emperor Zhu Yuanzhang, a former rebel who had risen on the Mandate's own logic, recognised the licence to kill tyrants in the canonical Mencius, ordered the sage expelled from the Confucian temple, and when his scholar-officials resisted to the point of carrying coffins to the palace, settled for an expurgated examination text — the Mengzi jiewen of 1394, eighty-five passages cut — which died with his generation while the full text returned to every schoolroom. And in the People's Republic, the internal party circular of 2013 known as Document No. 9 instructed cadres, in writing, to combat

constitutionalism, civil society, and universal values — the deposited words of the state's own constitution, which protesters had quoted on their banners in 1989 and a charter movement had fired again in 2008 — and the directive's existence is the concession: the words cannot be deleted, only forbidden. Four civilisations, one finding: deposited universal words are permanent — formation, once installed in the formed, is not the apex's to edit — and permanently insufficient. Unkillable, and, without somewhere to stand, unable to build. Both halves of the demotion, in the rulers' own failed scissors.

II. Second Revision: The Accident Is Upgraded

The phrase the project began from — happy accident — was coined to deny intention and direction, and the denial stands. But accident, in ordinary speech, also implies unrepeatability: the lottery ticket, the lightning strike, the outcome with no recipe. The inquiry's evidence will not carry that implication, and the essay proposes the correction formally. The configuration precipitated independently, on grounds with no common cause — a Germanic kingdom's baronial quarrels, a chain of settler colonies' tax revolt, a Scandinavian periphery's constitutional improvisation — and on every ground where the three conditions held, it precipitated; on every ground where one failed, it did not, across a thousand years of Byzantine pressure and two thousand of Chinese. That is not a lottery's signature; it is a process's. The exact phrase is by-product with a recipe, and the essay offers the industrial image deliberately: no one smelting iron is trying to make slag, but slag appears wherever smelting runs, in proportions set by the ore — and a metallurgist who learns the chemistry can get more of any by-product he decides he wants. Liberty, on the inquiry's evidence, is the by-product of a particular process — fragmented elites protecting themselves in universal language, under pressure, where independent positions stand — and nobody in the process is trying to make it; but the process has a chemistry, the chemistry is now substantially measured (the third part introduced the laboratory), and the by-product therefore has what pure accidents never have: an address at which it can be defended. The upgrade matters precisely for the defence: accidents can only be mourned when they end; by-products of maintained conditions can be kept precipitating, by maintaining the conditions — and lost, exactly and only, by letting the conditions lapse.

III. Third Revision: The Inheritors' Half

The third correction guards the phrase against an abuse its own grammar invites. Unintended consequence can be heard as saying that the excluded were passive beneficiaries — that liberty trickled down from elite quarrels onto populations who merely received it — and the inquiry's casework refuses that reading on every ground. The concessions were unintended by their authors; they were not unworked-for by their winners. Every widening in the corpus was priced against a threat, and the threat was manufactured — over decades, at cost, by the excluded themselves, building exactly the positions the third condition names: the abolitionists assembling their pulpits, presses, and societies for thirty years before any politician priced emancipation; the suffrage movements drilling petitions and processions across two generations before any chamber counted the cost of refusal; the labour movements building unions, strike funds, and parties through every prosecution until the eight-hour day became cheaper to grant than to fight; the Sami of the Norwegian volume, held out of every position for a century, waiting longest of all — the waiting itself the proof that the mechanism's speed is set by who holds positions, not by who deserves them. The accident, restated with both halves: the authors deposit the words and build the machinery without intending the clientele; the inheritors build the positions and manufacture the pressure without which the deposit is never paid out. Elite calculation and excluded organisation are not rival explanations; they are the two hands of the one mechanism, and a reader who drops

either is holding half a tool. This also settles the essay's quarrel with fatalism, the third arc it denies: nothing in the analysis counsels waiting, because the analysis's own evidence is that nothing is ever conceded to those who have not organised the price of refusal.

PART VI

THE LEDGER AND THE ASYMMETRY

What the Arrangement Verifiably Delivers, How Cheaply It Reverses, and Why the Reluctant Advocate Is the Load-Bearing Kind

A Note on Why This Part Exists

An argument that liberty is an accident, however upgraded, invites a question the project's author put at the founding: if no arc guarantees it and no design produced it, why defend it — and how, without the love its formation-bred defenders feel? This part answers with the only instruments the project permits: a ledger of measured gains, an audit of reversal's price, and a conclusion about which kind of advocate the evidence actually needs.

I. The Ledger

The gains are not matters of taste; they have a quantitative literature, and the essay introduces its main entries. The deepest is the economist Amartya Sen's finding, developed from his 1981 study Poverty and Famines through his 1999 Development as Freedom: substantial famines do not occur in functioning multiparty democracies with a free press — not because democracies command more food, but because famine is an information and incentive failure, and an arrangement in which rulers face elections and uncensored newspapers cannot ignore starvation at the speed autocracies can. The project's own casework supplies the dark mirror: the largest famine in human history, China's of 1959-61, ran for three years inside a state of total administrative reach precisely because the doctrine had removed every position — every newspaper, every rival, finally every minister — from which the apex could be told it was killing; thirty million dead, by the central estimates, of foreclosure itself. The growth entry: a 2019 study in the Journal of Political Economy by Daron Acemoglu and colleagues, "Democracy Does Cause Growth," tracked every democratisation and reversal since 1960 and found that crossing into democracy raises a country's income per head by roughly a fifth over the following quarter-century — through more investment in schooling and health, more reform, less unrest — a finding that survived the battery of methods the title's confidence required. The peace entry: the democratic-peace literature, descending from Immanuel Kant's 1795 sketch of a pacific federation through the political scientist Michael Doyle's revival of it in the 1980s, rests on one of the most robust regularities in international data — established liberal democracies almost never fight wars against each other — hedged, as the careful literature hedges it, by definitional disputes and by democracies' undiminished willingness to fight everyone else. And beneath the measurable entries sits the structural one, which the project values most because its whole casework turns on it: the arrangement institutionalises error-correction. Tested doctrine — the posture of revising when evidence defeats — is for most regimes a personal virtue of whoever holds the apex, lost at the succession; constitutional democracy is the only arrangement yet built that makes the posture structural, by guaranteeing the positions (opposition, press, courts, elections) from which the ruler can be priced, and by making the pricing's consequence — removal — routine, scheduled, and survivable. It is, in the

project's terms, the machine that keeps the doctrine tested whether or not anyone at the top wishes it; every alternative on the historical record eventually met the moment when no one could tell the master, and this volume's predecessors have counted what those moments cost.

The ledger has a debit column, and the essay enters it for honesty's sake: the arrangement is slow, frequently captured by its own positioned interests, structurally vulnerable to demagogy, and — the project's second inquiry turns on this — historically rare and possibly dependent on international conditions no single state controls. The entries are real. They are also, the essay notes, all arguments within the arrangement's own accounting — audible at all only because the arrangement guarantees the positions from which they are shouted.

II. The Asymmetry

The defence's urgency comes from a finding the casework forced and the present confirms: construction and reversal are not symmetric. Construction, the whole inquiry shows, is the work of centuries — Runnymede to the Reform Acts is six hundred years — and its price was paid in organising lifetimes and, where the timing failed, in blood. Reversal is cheap, fast, legal, and orderly. The corpus exhibits: the Norwegian and Swedish volumes watched the postwar credit architecture — two generations in the building — dismantled in a single decade by ordinary legislation, the machinery running backward as smoothly as forward because machinery has no direction, only operators; the Chinese volume watched the one counterweight the post-Mao survivors had built against the unpriced master — the constitutional term clock, the only timed succession any Leninist state ever achieved — deleted in 2018 by a vote of two thousand nine hundred and fifty-eight to two; the Swedish volume's present chapter watched a party quarantine — a counterweight of pure convention — end in one election cycle. The type case the modern literature builds from is Weimar Germany, and the essay describes it because its lesson is the asymmetry in one sequence: the most sophisticated constitution of its age was converted into dictatorship in under three months, almost entirely through its own instruments — the emergency-decree article that had normalised rule-by-decree for years before 1933, the legal appointment of the chancellor by conservative elites who priced him as containable, the Enabling Act passed by a parliament voting under intimidation but voting; the contemporary statement of the pattern is the political scientists Steven Levitsky and Daniel Ziblatt's 2018 How Democracies Die, which assembled the modern case file — Hungary, Turkey, Venezuela — to show that democracies now end not by coup but by election: the elected capturing the referees (courts, commissions), buying or breaking the press, and rewriting the rules, each step legal, gradual, and individually survivable-looking. And the present tense is measured, not anecdotal: the research institute V-Dem at the University of Gothenburg — which grades every country annually on hundreds of expert-coded indicators — reported in its 2026 assessment that nearly a quarter of the world's states are autocratising, with six of the ten newest cases in Europe and North America; and Freedom House, the Washington-based monitor whose Freedom in the World survey has run since 1973, recorded in its 2026 edition the twentieth consecutive year of net global decline, with the share of humanity living in countries rated free fallen from forty-six per cent to twenty-one in two decades. The same reports carry the resilience datum the essay enters with equal care, because the ledger discipline cuts both ways: of the eighty-seven countries rated free in 2005, more than eighty-five per cent have held the rating through the entire twenty-year decline — the arrangements under maintenance have mostly kept precipitating their by-product; the losses concentrate where the conditions were young, thin, or untended. The asymmetry, stated as the essay's finding: liberty is expensive to build, cheap to unbuild, and the unbuilding announces itself not as rupture but as housekeeping — a court reformed, a clock

adjusted, a register consolidated, a cordon retired — which is exactly why arcs are dangerous: a defender who believes the destination defends itself does not audit the housekeeping.

III. The Reluctant Advocate

Which returns the essay to the founding phrase, and discharges it. There are two kinds of advocate an arrangement can have. The formation-bred advocate loves it — was raised inside its story, holds its anniversaries sacred, experiences criticism of it as sacrilege — and formation-bred advocacy, the inquiry's own framework warns, is structurally blind: it defends the symbols while the filters are captured, mistakes veneration for maintenance, and, holding the arrangement as revealed, reads every erosion as impossible right up until it is complete. The reluctant advocate holds the arrangement as tested: a contingent assembly of inherited machinery, defended not for what it is but for what it verifiably does — the famine that does not happen, the succession that does not kill, the error that gets corrected, the ruler who can be told — and defended, therefore, by audit rather than anthem: watching the filters, pricing the housekeeping, tending the boring conditions on which the by-product depends. The project's author arrived at his reluctance honestly, by disbelieving the arcs; the essay's conclusion is that the reluctance is not a deficiency of his advocacy but its qualification. An arrangement whose deepest property is institutionalised error-correction is best defended by people who treat the arrangement itself as correctable — who can see it plainly, count what it costs, and notice when it is being unbuilt, precisely because they never expected history to protect it. The arc-believer guards a destiny, and destinies need no guards; the reluctant advocate guards a ledger, and ledgers are guarded by being read.

PART VII

WHAT IS NOT CLAIMED

The Limits of the Recipe, the Case That Marks Them, the Other Side's Ledger, and the Evidence That Would Break This Essay

A Note on Why an Argument Must State Its Edges

The project's coda holds that the tell of a revealed doctrine is its claim of a final state, and an essay arguing against teleologies must take special care not to become one — a liberal arc in structural dress, with the recipe as destiny. This part draws the edges: what the three conditions do not guarantee, what the foreclosed alternative genuinely delivered, the tension the project's second inquiry inherits, and — the discipline's last requirement — the findings that would falsify the essay's own thesis.

I. The Recipe Is Maintenance, Not Guarantee

The conditions are necessary on the inquiry's evidence; they are not sufficient, and the case that marks the limit is the one the last part introduced as reversal's type specimen. Weimar Germany possessed, on paper and substantially in fact, everything the recipe names: a fragmented elite, a constitution written in the fullest universal register of its century, and a dense ecology of independent positions — parties across the spectrum, a great press, strong unions, autonomous states, churches, courts. It fell anyway, in months, and the anatomy of its fall is the recipe's fine print. The floor of force was never the arrangement's own: the army and much of the judiciary and administration were inherited from the empire, their formation loyal to something older, and a counterweight staffed by men formed against the order counts at a fraction of its paper weight. The pressure spiked past the mechanism's working range: the Depression, arriving on a society already traumatised by defeat, inflation, and humiliation, repriced every position at once, and the threat literature's own arithmetic — concession when refusal's price spikes — ran in reverse, conservative elites pricing the demagogue as the cheaper containment and inviting him in legally, the gravest single miscalculation in the modern record. And the words faced, for the first time in the essay's casework, organised movements that did not want in: the loaded-words mechanism presumes excluded claimants firing the order's promises at it, and is structurally unprepared for claimants whose open programme is the order's destruction, climbing through its elections while disavowing its grammar. The lesson the essay draws is exact, not despairing: the conditions are maintenance conditions — they name what must be tended (the formation of the force's own staff, the working range of the pressure, the difference between claimants and arsonists), not what can be assumed. A recipe tells the metallurgist what the process needs; it does not promise the furnace cannot be wrecked.

II. The Other Ledger

Honesty also requires the foreclosed alternative's column to be totalled, because the inquiry's China and Byzantium volumes both found entries the triumphal register omits. Foreclosure delivers paxes — and not small ones. The unified Chinese arrangement, at its Qing height, kept more human beings alive simultaneously

than any order in history to that date, four hundred and thirty million under a famine-relief administration European visitors described with awe; the Byzantine arrangement shielded the eastern Mediterranean's cities and trade for centuries while the plural West burned; and plural Europe's liberty was purchased, the essay's own third part conceded, by a thousand years of inter-hierarchy war whose price the project's companion inquiry counts in continents. The First Inquiry's prize — liberty through maintained plurality — and the Second Inquiry's prize — peace through ordered scale — have stood, for most of recorded history, in different shops, and this essay does not pretend to have merged them. Whether arrangements exist that can hold both at once — constitutional federations, alliances of law, the rules-based orders now strained on every shore — is the second inquiry's live question, and the only honest statement here is that the modern liberal-democratic peace among plural states is historically young, externally conditioned, and exactly as reversible as everything else this essay has audited.

III. What Would Break This Essay

A tested thesis must name its falsifiers, and the essay names four. First: a documented case of durable, widening liberty — enforceable protections extending over generations to the unintended — arising where the apex owned all positions; one verified Chinese dynasty that bound itself, one Byzantine charter with teeth, would force the third condition's demotion from necessary to frequent. Second: a documented case of the conditions held — plurality maintained, words deposited, pressure within range — across, say, two centuries, without widening; a stable, tended plural order whose excluded organised and fired and never gained a notch would break the mechanism's joint. Third: a demonstration that the widenings the inquiry attributes to priced concession were in fact driven by elite conversion — that the diaries, debates, and division lists behind 1832, 1918, or 1964, properly read, show belief moving before threat; the concession literature is an empirical claim and dies by archives, not by preference. Fourth: a reversal record showing arrangements under full maintenance — filters audited, counterweights funded, formation renewed — collapsing at the same rate as untended ones; if tending confers no measured protection, the maintenance thesis is sentiment. The essay reports, as of its writing, no confirmed instance of any of the four, and it asks the reader — this is the posture, not a courtesy — to treat the search for them as part of the work.

PART VIII

THE POSTURE

Gardening Without an Arc — What the First Inquiry Finally Recommends, to Whom, and Why the Work Has No Last Day

I. The Argument, Reassembled

The essay closes by reassembling its argument in a single passage, for the reader who will carry one page away. There is no law of history. Societies are not travelling toward a classless harmony, and they are not travelling toward an enlightened justice; both arcs are revealed doctrines — termini that no evidence is permitted to refute — and both, in power or in complacency, do harm by their structure: the first by counting every corpse as a delay, the second by disarming the defenders of the very thing it promises. What the record actually contains is people in positions, deciding with the materials at hand; and on certain grounds — where elites are fragmented so that no faction owns the filter, where the binding language of legitimacy is universal so that the rulers' own protections are deposited in words without fences, and where positions stand outside the apex's ownership so that the words can be fired incrementally by the organised excluded — those decisions precipitate, without anyone intending it, the most valuable by-product in political history: enforceable liberty, widening over time. The precipitate is not an accident in the lottery sense; it has a recipe, now substantially measured. It is not a gift in the trickle-down sense; every notch was priced by a threat the excluded organised at cost. It is not a destination in any sense; it is a process under maintenance, and the maintenance — not the anniversaries — is the inheritance. And it is reversible: cheaply, legally, quietly, by housekeeping — a finding the present decade is measuring in real time, twenty consecutive years of audited decline alongside the quieter datum that the tended arrangements have mostly held.

II. The Address of the Work

The project's coda, written before the latest volumes, answered the oldest question — what is to be done — with a posture rather than a programme, and the casework since has only sharpened its address. Debug, don't defend: treat the arrangement's failures as faults to be located and fixed, not as sacrilege to be denied, because an arrangement defended as sacred is an arrangement nobody is maintaining. Tested, not revealed: hold every doctrine — including the constitution, including the market, including this essay — open to defeat by evidence, and treat any claim of a final state, from any direction, as the tell of a doctrine preparing to count corpses. Tend the counterweights without end: courts, presses, parties, unions, churches, universities ossify and are captured — the inquiry's Age of Liberty volume watched a free constitution rot into a foreign-funded syndicate in two generations — and a counterweight is not what its charter says but what its staffing does, which is why the durable contests are always at the filters: the appointments, the mandates, the nominations, the registers, the quiet machinery that decides who decides. Pry with the rulers' own words: the loaded deposits — every charter's universal sentences — remain the cheapest and most legitimate ammunition the excluded possess, wherever there is somewhere to stand; and building the somewhere — the association, the fund, the press, the

bench — is the work the words cannot do for themselves. And watch the housekeeping: reversal announces itself as administration, and the audit of boring changes to selection machinery is worth more than any vigil at the monuments.

III. The Last Page

The first inquiry ends, then, where its author began, with the phrase corrected but the temper kept. Liberal democracy is a happy accident — unintended by its builders, unguaranteed by any arc — and it is a by-product with a recipe, precipitating wherever the conditions are held and nowhere else, defended honestly only from its ledger: the famines that do not happen, the successions that do not kill, the rulers who can be told, the errors that get corrected, the lives that are measurably longer, richer, and freer where it runs. That ledger is real, the reversal of it is cheap, and nothing — no formation, no fund, no filter, no framework, and no essay — performs the watching on our behalf. The work is gardening, not architecture: no last stone, no topping-out, no day when the thing is finished and may be admired; only soil, weather, the standing tendency of every hedge to be eaten and every tool to be stolen, and the one finding this whole inquiry is finally for — that the garden, tended, keeps yielding, for one more generation at a time, which is the only tenure anything in this record has ever had. The arc does not exist. The recipe does. The rest is the work, and the work is never finished — which is not the inquiry's lament, but its instruction.

A Note on Sources

This essay synthesises the Patterns of Power case studies and the comparative scholarship it describes in the text. The historiographical frame draws on Herbert Butterfield's The Whig Interpretation of History (1931), Thomas Babington Macaulay's History of England, Francis Fukuyama's The End of History and the Last Man (1992), Seymour Martin Lipset's 1959 statement of the modernisation hypothesis and Adam Przeworski and Fernando Limongi's 1997 re-examination, and Karl Popper's The Open Society and Its Enemies (1945). The treatment of Marx rests on the Communist Manifesto, Engels's Anti-Dühring, György Lukács's History and Class Consciousness (1923), and, for the Asiatic-mode question, Karl Wittfogel's Oriental Despotism (1957). The recipe's literatures: Charles Tilly's Coercion, Capital, and European States (1990); Walter Scheidel's Escape from Rome (2019); Albert Hirschman's Exit, Voice, and Loyalty (1970); Joel Mokyr's A Culture of Growth (2016); David Stasavage's The Decline and Rise of Democracy (2020); Douglass North and Barry Weingast's "Constitutions and Commitment" (Journal of Economic History, 1989); North, Wallis, and Weingast's Violence and Social Orders (2009); Daron Acemoglu and James Robinson's Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy (2006), Why Nations Fail (2012), and The Narrow Corridor (2019); Toke Aidt and Raphaël Franck's study of the Great Reform Act (Econometrica, 2015); Aidt and Jensen on franchise extension under revolutionary threat; Magnus Rasmussen and Carl Henrik Knutsen on labour reform in 1919; Jack Goldstone's Revolution and Rebellion in the Early Modern World (1991); Peter Turchin's structural-demographic work; and Ibn Khaldun's Muqaddimah behind both. The ledger rests on Amartya Sen's Poverty and Famines (1981) and Development as Freedom (1999); Acemoglu, Naidu, Restrepo, and Robinson's "Democracy Does Cause Growth" (Journal of Political Economy, 2019); the democratic-peace literature from Kant through Michael Doyle; and, for reversal, Steven Levitsky and Daniel Ziblatt's How Democracies Die (2018), the V-Dem Institute's Democracy Report 2026, and Freedom House's Freedom in the World 2026, from which the present-day figures are taken. American particulars follow the standard editions of the Federalist, Charles Beard's An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution (1913) with its critical literature, and the documented speeches of Douglass (1852), Calhoun (1848), and Lincoln (1857). The case-study findings cited throughout are documented in the project's own volumes, each of which carries its sources. All errors of fact or emphasis remain the collaboration's own.